REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **20 February 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-26, and 28-30. Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-13, 15, 16, 18-23, 25, 26, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ellison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,547, hereinafter "Ellison"), and Ho (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,342, hereinafter "Ho"). Examiner rejected claims 4, 14 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ellison, Ho, and Nilsen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,606,693, hereinafter "Nilsen").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-26, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), asserting that these claims are unpatentable over Ho in view of Ellison. Applicant respectfully disagrees, because neither Ellison, nor Ho, nor a combination of the two, teach the elements of "determining if the user is an enterprise user" and "querying the directory server for a user profile associated with the user" as disclosed in claim 1 of the Instant Application.

Specifically, Ho discloses:

> *For optimal security,* ***each of the subnetworks described will be under the control of a different administrator. Each administrator will not have control over computers outside of the respective subnetwork.*** *By partitioning sensitive data and distributing storage and retrieval of sensitive data over different subnetworks of computers, the data will be protected from improper access by an individual administrator of a subnetwork.* (Ho, Column 2, Lines 20-33)

Ho discloses a system wherein access to resources is controlled by local administrators, and wherein only local administrators for each subnetwork control the resources for their corresponding subnetworks. The impetus for Ho is to restrict control and administration of resources to individual administrators overseeing local subnetworks to eliminate the risk of a global administrator having access to sensitive data from multiple subnetworks. Moreover, neither Ho,

10

nor Ellison disclose "querying the directory server for a user profile associated with the user."

In contrast to Ho, embodiments of the present invention provide a system that "determines if the user is an enterprise user". (Instant Application, claim 1) In these embodiments, the system will retrieve information for the user from a directory server once the user is determined to be an enterprise user. One skilled in the art of databases will appreciate that an "enterprise user" is a user that has a unique identity across an enterprise. Enterprise users connect to individual databases through a schema, and are assigned enterprise roles that determine their access privileges on these individual databases. The whole impetus for "enterprise users" is to globally manage users and remove the burden and cost of local administration. See, e.g., *Oracle 9i Database Platform Guide* (http://download-west.oracle.com/docs/html/B10163_01/glossary.htm#i433078, last published in 2003)

Therefore, Ho fails to teach "determining if the user is an enterprise user", because Ho teaches away from the use of "enterprise users" in favor of local subnetwork administration.

Additionally, Examiner avers that Applicant's specification fails to address the fact that an enterprise user has a unique identity across an enterprise. Applicant respectfully points out that the term "enterprise user" is well-known and established in the art. Oracle Corporation's *Oracle 9i Database Platform Guide* (http://download-west.oracle.com/docs/html/B10163_01/glossary.htm#i433078, last published in 2003) clearly defines an "enterprise user" as: "A user that has a unique identity across an enterprise."

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to further define the "enterprise user." Support for these amendments can be found in: http://download-west.oracle.com/docs/html/B10163_01/glossary.htm#i433078.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21, as currently amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits

11

that claims 2-6 and 8-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-16 and 18-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-26 and 28-30 which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   __/Shun Yao/_____
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 21 April 2008

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com